

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated May 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated February 21, 2007

Docket No.:0465-1116PUS
Page 11

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet including the same Figure. The typographical error in the original Fig. 1 "Main video sinal" was corrected to "Main video signal."

Attachment: Annotated Sheet
 Replacement sheet

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated May 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated February 21, 2007

Docket No.:0465-1116PUS
Page 12

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-43 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 21 are independent. Claims 40-43 have been added, and claims 1, 5, 13 and 21-39 have been amended by the present amendment. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 3, 2005, and for providing Applicant with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 or PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to Fig. 1 because of spelling error. Accordingly, Fig. 1 has been amended to address this issue. Further, to overcome the objection to Fig 2, paragraph [0034] line 5 of the specification has been amended to introduce the reference symbol "S560," shown in Fig. 2. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Specification Objection

Regarding the objections to the specification, the specification has been amended to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Office Action and to correct other minor informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated May 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated February 21, 2007

Docket No.: 0465-1116PUS
Page 13

Claim Objections

The appropriate claims have been amended to be numbered 1-39 as requested in the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 21-23 and 32-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hung-yi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Amended independent claim 1 includes a combination of steps and is directed to a method of providing an advance screen saver warning for a display apparatus including the steps of predetermining a screen saver standby time and an advance screen saver warning time, counting a current system idle time during which no system input activity is detected, and activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time. Further, the activated advance screen saver warning is continuously executed by the display apparatus until a detection of system activity, whereupon the advance screen saver warning is deactivated, and the screen saver is activated only if the advance screen saver warning time is completed. Amended independent claim 21 includes similar features with a varying scope.

Thus, the advance screen saver warning time warns a user about upcoming activation of the screen saver when there is a specific period of system input inactivity. On the contrary, Hung-yi warns a user about upcoming termination of the user's computer usage when the time-limit for the usage is about to expire. Moreover, Hung-yi does not teach or suggest "counting a current system idle time during which no system input activity is detected" as recited in claims 1 and 21 of Applicant's invention. Rather, Hung-yi counts the time during which the system activity is detected. Further, Hung-yi does not teach or suggest continuous execution of the warning and deactivation of warning upon a detection of system activity.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated May 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated February 21, 2007

Docket No.:0465-1116PUS
Page 14

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 21 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections have also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims and the additional applied references also do not teach or suggest the features recited in the independent claim.

Claims Added

Claims 40-43 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicant submits the new claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application. It is respectfully submitted the new claims further define over the applied art.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated May 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated February 21, 2007

Docket No.: 0465-1116PUS
Page 15

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Annotated Sheet
Replacement Sheet

David A. Bilodeau
Registration No. 42,325

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

ANNOTATED SHEET**FIG. 1**